arXiv:0903.2027v2 [quant-ph] 29 Apr 2009

Preparations in non-Markovian quantum mechanics

Kavan Modi[1, 2, *]
[1]*Center for Complex Quantum Systems, Department of Physics,*
The University of Texas at Austin, Austin TX, USA
[2]*Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Singapore*
(Dated: April 29, 2009)

I analyze preparation of quantum systems for open quantum mechanics that are non-Markovian. I show that preparations in this regime play an important role in the dynamics of the system. They serve as the mechanism for the memory due to the environment.

PACS numbers: 02.50.Ey, 02.50.Ga, 03.65.Ca, 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Wj

A quantum experiment is composed of three general steps. The experiment begins with an unknown state, which is prepared into a known input state. The prepared state is subjected to some quantum operation. Finally, the output state is observed. State preparation is the first step for any quantum experiment; for this reason a great deal of attention has been devoted to this topic. However, much of the discussion revolves around preparing specific states in specific systems, i.e squeeze states in optical systems, or entangled states in solid-state qubits, etc. Yet, this topic has received little foundational attention since the early years of quantum theory, especially for open systems.

The lack of fundamental attention for theory of preparation was pointed out some years ago by Park and Band [1]. They beautifully remark that a preparation is not to be confused with a measurement[1]. They go on to elaborate on many different ways to prepare quantum states, including mixed states and point out the differences between different preparation procedures and discuss the usefulness of each.

Some time ago, some colleagues and I, showed that preparation procedures in quantum process tomography experiments play a non-trivial role [2]. In this letter I extend that results by developing a general theory for preparation of quantum states. In specific, the theory deals with quantum systems that are affected by the surrounding degrees of freedom, i.e. systems that exhibit open dynamics. Especially for the case where the system is initially (before preparation) correlated with the environment, it will shown that act of preparation contributes to the 'quantum memory' when the dynamics is of non-Markovian nature.

Before I start with the theory of preparation, let me motivate this paper by a simple argument. Consider a single qubit experiment that requires two pure states, say $|x,+\rangle$ and $|z,+\rangle$, not necessarily simultaneously. Suppose the experimentalist has an oven that evacuates a beam silver atoms with no preferred polarization. The experimentalist has to prepare this thermal beam into desired states. There are several ways of making the desired preparations, let me consider two.

(*i.*) Send the beam through a magnetic field along the x-direction. The thermal beam splits into two beams with states $|x,+\rangle$ and $|x,-\rangle$. Discard the beam with state $|x,-\rangle$ and proceed with the experiment with the remaining beam. To prepare the $|z,+\rangle$ state, send the thermal beam through a magnetic field along z-direction and follow the same prescriptions as in the case with $|x,+\rangle$ preparation.

(*ii.*) Prepare $|x,+\rangle$ state same as in the first procedure. But instead of discarding the $|x,-\rangle$ beam, unitarily rotate it to state $|z,+\rangle$.

The question that I tackle in this letter is: *are the two sets of experiments the same?* Below I show that they indeed are not when the experiment is *open* and the system is *initially correlated* with the surrounding degrees of freedom.

In practice, preparation procedures can be very complicated. Instead of describing many different preparation procedures in detail, I develop a general theory of preparations in terms of standard mathematical tools. A preparation procedure is the mapping of a set of unknown states, ρ, into a fix known input state, P^m. The most general transformation of a quantum state is described by a stochastic map [3]. In light of that, a very complicated preparation procedure due to the aparatus, is simply denote by stochastic map, $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}$. The procedure of preparing the mth input state is given as

$$\rho \longrightarrow \frac{1}{r^{(m)}}\mathcal{A}^{(m)}(\rho) = P^{(m)}, \tag{1}$$

where $r^{(m)} = \mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{A}^{(m)}(\rho)]$ is the probability with which ρ goes to $P^{(m)}$. I have not required the preparation map to be trace preserving. This is because many preparation procedures are implemented strictly by getting rid of particles in unwanted states[2].

---

[1] Many years ago, as a new student of quantum mechanics, I and a friend had this very conversation and agreed that a preparation must be a measurement.

One condition I do put is that the preparation map be completely positive [4, 5]. Since the preparation map should take any state to a fixed state, its domain must be set of all system states, hence it must be completely positive. I consider experiments that require multiple input states. According Eq. 1, each input has a preparation map associated with it, hence a preparation procedure. The main result of the paper is show how different preparation procedures affect the experiment differently for open quantum systems.

For open quantum systems, the situation above does not change very much, one can simply replace the unknown state of the system by an unknown state of the system and the environment, transforming Eq. 1 into

$$\rho^{\mathcal{SE}} \longrightarrow \left[\frac{1}{r^{(m)}}\mathcal{A}^{(m)} \otimes \mathcal{I}\right]\left(\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}\right) = R^{\mathcal{SE}^{(m)}}, \qquad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ is the identity map acting on the state of the environment. In other words, I am assuming that the preparation procedure acts only on the system.

In general, the state of the system and the environment before preparation, $\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}$, will be correlated (see [6]). The goal of the preparation procedure is to eliminate these correlations, as for an ideal experiment the state of the system should be uncorrelated with the environment at the beginning of the experiment [3]. Therefore, under *perfect preparation procedure assumption*, the right hand side of Eq. 2, or the post-preparation procedure state, is of product form[4].

The difference between preparation procedures for closed systems and open systems lie entirely in the correlations shared by the system and the environment. The preparation procedure acts only on the system, the state of environment is affected by that action due to the shared correlations. Therefore, to be most general the state of the environment has dependency on the preparation procedure.

$$\frac{1}{r^{(m)}}\mathcal{A}^{(m)}\left(\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}\right) = P^{(m)} \otimes \rho^{\mathcal{E}^{(m)}}. \qquad (3)$$

Subscript m of the state of the environment in the last equation means that the state of the environment has dependency on the mth preparation procedure.

Eq. 3 is the main result of this letter. It shows that the act of preparation affects the state of the environment. This is not a trivial issue for a system that experiences non-Markovian dynamics [7, 8]. In such instances, the state of the environment acts as the 'memory' of the system. Meaning, this information will come into the system at a latter time. According to Eq. 3, for different input states, the state of the environment will be different and therefore the corresponding memory term will be different as well.

At this point, I would like to describe three preparation procedures. The first procedure will clearly show this dependency of the state of the environment on the preparation procedure. The second procedure aims to eliminate this dependency. And finally the last procedure shows how inconsistent implementation of the second procedure can lead to the state of the environment depending on the preparation procedure.

Projective Preparation. Consider an optical experiments, where a beam of photons is sent through a polarizer [9, 10, 11], which projects the polarization vector of the photons into a set of orthogonal directions. I call this *projective preparation* method. Mathematically this is summarized as

$$\frac{1}{r^{(m)}}\mathcal{A}^{(m)}\left(\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}\right) = \frac{1}{r^{(m)}}P^{(m)}\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}P^{(m)} = P^{(m)} \otimes \rho^{\mathcal{E}^{(m)}}, \qquad (4)$$

where $P^{(m)}$ is the mth projector in the system space as well as the desired input state and $r^{(m)} = \mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{A}^{(m)}\rho] = \mathrm{Tr}[P^{(m)}\rho]$; this is the probability of obtaining that particular input state from a von-Neumann measurement.

The state of the environment has picked the subscript m due to the fact that in general $\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}$ contains correlations between the system and the environment. I should again emphasize that the preparation procedure only acts on the system, the state of the environment is affected only indirectly.

The analysis of projective preparation shows that the state of the environment after the preparation depends on the preparation procedure due to the pre-existing correlations with the system. Should the environment and the system interact in non-Markovian fashion then the dynamics for different input states will differ due to the differences in the states of the environment. The dependancy of the environment on the preparation procedure can lead to unwanted behavior of the experiment [2, 12]. For this reason this dependency may be unwanted for experimental purposes. Let me now discuss a method of preparation that keeps the state of the environment constant for any input state of the system.

Stochastic preparation. Many quantum experiments begin by initializing the system into a specific state. For instance, in the simplest case, the system can be prepared to the ground state by cooling it to near absolute zero temperature [13, 14, 15, 16]. Mathematically, these set of operations are written as a pin map [17],

---

[2] A preparation map that does not preserve trace can be thought of as part of a map that does preserve trace. To see this, write a completely positive trace preserving map as $\mathcal{A}(\rho) = \sum_m \pi^{(m)}\rho\, \pi^{(m)\dagger}$, where $\sum^{(m)} \pi^{(m)\dagger}\pi^{(m)} = \mathbb{1}$ guarantees trace preservation. Now define $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}(\rho) = \pi^{(m)}\rho\, \pi^{(m)\dagger}$. Meaning a non trace preserving map for the mth preparation belongs to a set of preparations $\{\mathcal{A}^{(m)}\}$, which together preserve the trace.

[3] In this letter, I am not studying imperfect preparation procedures, rather I am studying the affect of the preparation procedure on the experimental results.

[4] Typically preparation procedures aim to prepare pure states, which guarantees the product form for the system and the environment.

$$\Theta = |\Phi\rangle \langle\Phi| \otimes \mathbb{1}, \tag{5}$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ is the identity matrix, acting as the 'trace operator' ($\mathbb{1}_{rs}\rho_{rs} = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho]$) and $|\Phi\rangle$ is some fixed state (i.e. ground state) of the system. In this procedure, no matter what the initial state of the system was, it is "pinned" to the final state $|\Phi\rangle \langle\Phi|$.

The action of the pin map Θ on a bipartite state of the system and the environment.

$$\Theta\left(\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}\right) \;=\; \left[|\Phi\rangle \langle\Phi| \otimes \mathbb{1}\right]\left(\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}\right) = |\Phi\rangle \langle\Phi| \otimes \rho^{\mathcal{E}}. \tag{6}$$

The pin map fixes the system into a single pure state, which means that the state of the environment is fixed into a single state as well; the pin map decorrelates the system from the environment. Once the pin map, Θ, is applied, the system is prepared in the various different input states by applying local

$$\mathcal{A}^{(m)}\left(\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}\right) \;=\; \Omega^{(m)} \circ \Theta(\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}) = P^{(m)} \otimes \rho^{\mathcal{E}}.$$

As seen the last equations, the advantage of stochastic preparation method, as described here, is that the state of the environment is a constant for any input of the system. This constancy of the state of the environment is necessary to characterize the dynamical mechanisms properly [12].

A word of caution is necessary at this point. It may seem that stochastic preparation procedure alleviates the experiment from having an environment that depends on the preparation procedure. I analyze this matter in much greater detail elsewhere [18], however, for the last example I would like discuss how the procedure above can go wrong when the stochastic method is implemented in an inconsistent manner.

Multiple Stochastic Preparations. Strictly speaking, in a real experiment the pin map is a complicated set of steps. For instance, cooling the system so it relaxes to the ground state is very different from optically pumping a system to an excited state. Two different pin maps would correspond to these two different methods. Then, the state of the environment in each case can also be different. I assumed, in Eq. 2, that the preparation procedure does act on the environment. This may not be the case; therefore, to be careful, I should label $\rho^{\mathcal{E}}$ as $\rho^{\mathcal{E}}_{\Theta}$ to clarify that the state of the environment may depend on certain steps involved in applying the pin map.

Then, it should be emphasized that the initial pin map is critical. It may be tempting to simply use a set of pin maps, $\Theta^{(m)}$, to prepare the various input states $P^{(m)}$. The different input states will be

$$\mathcal{A}^{(m)}\left(\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}\right) = \Theta^{(m)}\left(\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}\right) = P^{(m)} \otimes \rho_{\Theta}^{\mathcal{E}\,(m)}. \tag{7}$$

As seen in the last line of the equation above, the state of the environment has taken the subscript $\Theta^{(m)}$ through different pin maps along with the input state. What this means is that the state of the environment is affected by the preparation procedure.

What I have demonstrated in this letter is that preparation procedures can play a role in the dynamics of the system in sense that they affect the environment which in return affects the system. A few remarks about when preparation procedures play a role in dynamics are necessary. One, if the experiment is closed in nature, then there is no environment to worry about and any set preparation procedure are equivalent. Two, if the system is initially uncorrelated with the surrounding, then generally the preparation procedure will not play a role in dynamics. However there will be some cases where this rule will not hold, see [18] for an example). Three, if the interaction with the environment is of Markovian type, i.e. the environment does not kick back the system, then the preparation procedures will not affect the dynamics of the system.

In [18] I show several simple examples demonstrating the three principles stated above. More interestingly, the analysis there give a recipe to test if a system is of Markovian or non-Markovian nature.

Acknowledgments. I am grateful to Aik-Meng Kuah, Ali Rezakhani, César Rodríguez-Rosario, George Sudarshan, and Daniel Terno for valuable conversations. This work was financially supported by the National Research Foundation and the Ministry of Education of Singapore.

---

[*] Email: cqtkkm@nus.edu.sg.

[1] J. Park and W. Band, Foundations of Physics **22**, 657 (1992), URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01889671`.

[2] A.-M. Kuah, K. Modi, C. A. Rodriguez-Rosario, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 042113 (pages 12) (2007).

[3] E. Sudarshan, P. Mathews, and J. Rau, Phys. Rev. **121**, 920 (1961).

[4] M. D. Choi, Can. J. Math. **24**, 520 (1972).

[5] M. D. Choi, Linear Algebra and Appl. **10**, 285 (1975).

[6] K. Modi, arXiv:0902.0735 (2008).

[7] H. P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford university press, New York, 2002).

[8] C. A. Rodríguez-Rosario and E. C. G. Sudarshan, arXiv:0803.1183 (2008).

[9] M. A. Nielsen, E. Knill, and R. Laflamme, Nature **396**, 52 (1998).

[10] A. M. Childs, I. L. Chuang, and D. W. Leung, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 012314 (2001).

[11] M. W. Mitchell, C. W. Ellenor, S. Schneider, and A. M. Steinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 120402 (2003).

[12] K. Modi, Ph.D. thesis, The University of Texas at Austin (2008).

[13] J. L. O'Brien, G. J. Pryde, A. Gilchrist, D. F. V. James, N. K. Langford, T. C. Ralph, and A. G. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 080502 (2004).

[14] M. Howard, J. Twamley, C. Wittmann, T. Gaebel, F. Jelezko, and J. Wrachtrup, New J. Phys. **8**, 33 (2006).

[15] S. H. Myrskog, J. K. Fox, M. W. Mitchell, and A. M. Steinberg, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 013615 (2005).

[16] Y. S. Weinstein, T. F. Havel, J. Emerson, N. Boulant, M. Saraceno, S. Lloyd, and D. G. Cory, J. Chem. Phys. **121**, 120402 (2004).

[17] V. Gorini and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Comm. Math. Phys. **46**, 43 (1976).

[18] K. Modi and E. C. G. Sudarshan, arXiv:0904.4663 (2009).